DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 452 278 TM 032 566

AUTHOR Stine, David O.
TITLE Developing an Evaluation System To Improve Principal Performance and Accountability.
PUB DATE 2001-04-00
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Seattle, WA, April 10-14, 2001).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accountability; *Administrator Evaluation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Evaluation Methods; *Principals; School Districts
IDENTIFIERS California

ABSTRACT

The process of principal evaluation was studied in 17 elementary, unified, high school, and county school districts in California through various methodologies. The information analysis revealed that the three standard formats identified by L. Webb (1987) (free form, check list, and management by objectives) were used. In most cases, the evaluation systems included some aspects of each as part of the process. Most districts have clearly communicated criteria in the form of checklists and complemented them with some specific goals and objectives. The districts used a variety of criteria in different combinations, often accompanied by a specific set of program objectives but often lacking any professional improvement plan for the principal. Nine examples from these districts are included to give a range of the approaches used. Fifteen exhibits include the Association of California School Administrators Bill of Rights, the nine examples of evaluation systems, and supplemental information. (Contains 18 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

DEVELOPING AN EVALUATION SYSTEM TO IMPROVE PRINCIPAL PERFORMANCE AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Dr. David O. Stine, Professor
California State University
San Bernardino

Presented at the
Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association

April 10-14, 2001
Seattle, Washington

ED 452 278

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
D. Stine
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

TM032566

For additional information: Dr. David O. Stine - CSUSB, 5500 University Parkway
San Bernardino, CA 92407-2397. (909) 880-5673. FAX [909] 880=7510.
EMail: dstine@csusb.edu

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PRINCIPAL EVALUATION: A PROCESS FOR SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

Having to discipline, reassign, demote, or terminate a site administrator is a difficult management task and one that has multiple effects on numerous constituent groups. When the individual administrator fails, the school is in trouble. There are often strong feelings both in support of the decision and contrary to it. The process of replacement then becomes a critical issue in the carousel of activities which begins again with the announcement, recruitment, screening, selection, assignment, and orientation for the replacement as a new cycle begins again. To avoid this disruptive sequence of events, an evaluation process needs to be in place which will promote the priorities and the district and will model collaborative school improvement.

Jones (1994) suggests that, "Two major purposes for personnel appraisal, are, first, to facilitate administrative decisions about personnel, and second, to guide personnel in performing their duties." p. 150. The superintendent needs a system in order to make the appropriate decisions of continued employment, promotion, re-assignment, or termination. These critical alternatives mandate a process that is clearly understood by both superintendent and principal. Secondly, the same system can be a diagnostic tool to identify strengths or areas for improvement in the employee. Jones elaborates by saying that the appraisal can determine how administrators use their time and balance their responsibilities. This dimension is critical in the assessment of the

individual and usually has a direct impact on the school improvement process. Key questions which should be asked, 1) Is the principal's time being spent productively and are the activities being done support the mission of the district?

Weiss (1989) suggests that the key benefits of principal evaluation are the establishment of communication and the facilitation of mutual goal-setting by principals and superintendents. These notions suggest a developed time line for the process that would include joint pre-planning and goal-setting, mid-term monitoring, and collaborative, summative evaluation. Dates should be established in advance and the format needs to be clear to both parties. Some experts recommend regular periodic conferences too. Communication is the cornerstone of collaborative efforts. There should be no surprises.

In order to enhance evaluation, Lindahl (1986) suggests that the whole process must begin with precise job descriptions which would provide structure to the summative evaluation instrument; however, the job description alone is insufficient. The "Bill of Rights" of the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), Exhibit A, begins with the premise that every administrator is entitled ". . . to a written description of the professional duties and responsibilities expected to be fulfilled." p.89. Thomas (1979) advocates that evaluations are both subjective and objective and that individuals need to be evaluated for their personal contributions as well as on the

program outcomes. He goes on to say that evaluation is most effective when it, "motivates people as well as validates human performance." p. 55. Townley (1998) concurs with the motivation dimension and adds the component of professional growth recommendations as an outcome of the process. The evaluation process can rate the individual and also assess the productivity of programs and activities in the school. If used correctly, the evaluation process can command the principal as well as provide direction for future growth. Problems and concerns should be identified and communicated as soon as possible to the principal to allow them to be remedied. The "Bill of Rights" of ACSA again calls for full and impartial evaluation as well as constructive counseling.

Webb (1987) finds there are three standard formats for evaluations – Free Form, Check List, and Management by Objectives. A recent information analysis of 17 school districts in California revealed that all three of these formats were used and in most cases, the evaluation systems included each as a part of the process; however, the checklist seemed to be the primary component to reflect the overall expectations for principal performance. Selected examples of check lists are provided in exhibits B through K. One district utilized the free form format only where the evaluator was asked to comment on strengths, needs, and other comments (Exhibit K). It is interesting that district has used the form successfully for over 15 years and it seems to meet the needs of that district. Most districts have clearly communicated criteria in

the form of checklists, and complemented them with some specific goals and objectives. Most included an addendum for other comments.

Seyfarth (1991) has listed 7 basic criteria for evaluating principals (Exhibit L). The seven seems to be clustered into 3 groups, 1) planning and instruction; 2) personnel, motivation and conflict management; and 3) outside contacts. The local study revealed a variety of criteria in different combinations and often these were accompanied by a specific set of program objectives. They often were void of any professional improvement plan for the individual principal.

Regardless of which format or combinations are used, there is merit in agreeing to certain objective indicators that can validate outcomes. Valentine (1987) recommends that data sources could take the form of student attendance records, test scores, committee reports, newsletters, clippings and time logs. He also suggests that shadowing the principal might be useful as well as using feedback surveys from teachers, support staff, students and parents. Other examples could include a portfolio of schedules, staff development activities, meeting agendas, school recognition or awards, external funding, budget reports, student discipline data, drop-out rates, innovative programs, parent participation, and articulation activities. The list could be extensive, but should be limited to those items most relevant to the particular school and it's specific goals.

Rebore (1998) states that the superintendent should make the final decisions on principal evaluations, but that input should be solicited from all appropriate central office administrators.

Most evaluations seem to include both subjective and objective criteria as Thomas (1979) indicated. A list of subjective criteria taken from the samples illustrate 17 items that range from adaptability to attitude to decisiveness to loyalty, Exhibit M. One district had 18 criteria of which 11 were clearly subjective in nature and included items like initiative, creativeness, and perseverance, Exhibit J.

The districts which were studied included elementary, unified, high school, and county schools. They represented urban, suburban, and rural settings and the districts were coded for reference purposes, (Exhibit N); however, no attempt to determine common characteristics by district organization was made because of the small sample.

The 9 examples of evaluations have been included to give the reader a range of experience from a variety of districts. The exhibits illustrate the differences of criteria which are used in administrator evaluations and extend in a range from personal characteristics to leadership styles, to management skills, to content

expertise. It is hoped that these examples will be useful to those who supervise and will provide an improved basis for evaluation. The goal is to develop a system which is fair and provides for accountability.

The content of evaluation form is critical. But is only one dimension. The process is even more significant. The evaluation processes that are most effective are those which are collaborative in nature and include a combination of check-list, free form, and management by objectives. The checklist provides the advantage of a large number of specific criteria, while the free form allows for a subjective narrative. The MBO portion exists to focus on particular issues or problems.

Exhibit O is a recommendation for the process and includes a time-line and lists of whom should be involved in each step. The sample includes the board of education, the superintendent, the principal, faculty and the School Site Council. Each play a unique roll in establishing the foundation for the process.

Summary

Principal performance and accountability are "buzz" words in our profession today. There are some who say that the evaluation process is taken too lightly and it's just some meaningless process that is required. Others indicate it makes no difference in

the personnel decisions that are made. If the superintendent wants to fire you, he can find a reason.

All of these comments justify a collaborative system which includes clear expectation and appropriate goals and evaluation. It is hoped that the 15 exhibits in this paper will generate thoughtfulness to revisit your existing system and improve it.

Exhibit A

Association of California
School Administrators

Bill of Rights

ACSA encourages that each member be afforded:

1. The right to a written description of the professional duties and responsibilities expected to be fulfilled.

2. The right to a full and impartial evaluation of professional performance including constructive counseling on a regular and continuing basis.

3. The right to participate in staff "in-service" training program(s) to improve professional performance.

4. The right to be furnished the reason(s) when recommended for probation, demotion, non-renewal of contract, or termination.

5. The right to due process procedures including the right to be heard by the Board of Education prior to probation, demotion, non-renewal of contract, or termination

6. The right to professional assistance from professional associations.

7. The right to adequate compensation for providing important, complex, and learned professional services.

8. The right to input in district policy and procedure development consistent with the individual's position on the management team and the individual's unique experience and expertise.

9. The right to be accorded the respect and dignity due a member of an honorable and learned profession and an individual, sensitive, human being.

Association of California School Administrators (1998). Leadership Directory and Guide to Members Benefits & Service. Sacramento, CA. (p. 89)

Exhibit B

Principal Evaluation
Standard Criteria

Planning and Goal Setting

Organizational Skills

Communication

Fiscal Responsibility

Facilities / Operations

Curricular Leadership

Instructional Leadership

Staff Development

Personal Management

Staff Management

Human Relations

Community Relations

Personal / Professional Improvement

Time Management

Stine, D. O. (1998) Executive Summary of 17 selected school districts in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties.

Principal Evaluation

"Indicators of Effective Leadership for Principals"

I. Principal as Manager

II. Principal as Visionary Leader

- A. Set direction and establish a clear and focused vision
- B. Alignment of Staff
- C. Motivate and Inspire Staff

III. Principal as Learning Leader

- A. Staff training and opportunities to grow
- B. Implement programs and strategies necessary to maximize student learning
  1. Safe, orderly and nurturing environment
  2. Climate of high expectations
  3. Opportunity to Learn
  4. Home – school relations
- C. Monitoring student achievement

(followed by 93 specific "Indicators of effective leadership for principals".)

Stine, D. O. (1998) Executive Summary of 17 selected school districts in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties.

Principal Evaluation

"Principal General Performance Appraisal"

1. Management Decision Making
2. Management organizational skill
3. Communication – Clarity
4. Communication – Human Relations
5. Communication – Facilitation
6. Community Relations
7. Personnel Management – Evaluation
8. Personnel Management – Assignments
9. Staff development
10. Resources – Maintenance
11. Physical Resources – Effective Use
12. Decision making

Note: All standards are evaluated 1) Meets or exceeds expectation or 2) Needs improvement

Stine, D. O. (1998) Executive Summary of 17 selected school districts in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties.

Principal Evaluation
"Administrator Evaluation"

A. Planning

B. Organizing

C. Staff Development

D. Interpersonal Relations

E. Community Relations

F. Leadership

G. Decision making

H. Knowledge

(17 specific indicators. Criteria are rated 1) Satisfactory, 2) Unsatisfactory, or 3) No opportunity to observe

Stine, D. O. (1998) Executive Summary of 17 selected school districts in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties.

Principal Evaluation

"Summation Evaluation Report"

1. Productive leadership in planning for the future (5 indicators)
2. Improving the educational process (20 indicators)
3. Promoting staff development (6 indicators)
4. Managing operation (11 indicators)
5. Implementing district policies and administrative regulations (2 indicators)
6. Promoting a positive and active school environment for student growth (5 indicators)
7. Promoting community relations (5 indicators)
8. Demonstrating professional responsibilities (4 indicators)

Total 59

Note: Criteria are rated 1) Not observed; 2) Does not meet standard; 3) Needs improvement; 4) Meets standard; 5) Exceeds standard

Stine, D. O. (1998) Executive Summary of 17 selected school districts in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties.

Exhibit G

Principal Evaluation

"General Expectancy Criteria"

1. Oral communications
2. Written communications
3. Decision making and problem solving
4. Delegating authority
5. Leadership
6. Time management
7. Flexibility and adaptability
8. Initiative/Creativity
9. Public contact and public awareness
10. Job knowledge
11. Planning – Short and long range
12. Personnel management and contract administration
13. Instructional Skills
14. Cooperation and participation
15. Integrity
16. Interpersonal skills
17. Policies, regulations, and procedures
18. Safety/loss control
19. Fiscal management skills
20. Program Evaluation

Note: All criteria were rated 1) Below standard, 2) Standard, 3) Above Standard

Stine, D. O. (1998) Executive Summary of 17 selected school districts in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties.

Exhibit H

Expectations for School Administrators

"Dimensions of performance evaluation and professional development for certificated management, supervisory and Confidential personnel."

I. Communications
   Oral Written

II. Decision-making
   Analysis
   Judgement
   Decisiveness
   Extra-organizational sensitivity

III. Management
   Planning and organizing
   Delegations and follow-up

IV. Interpersonal
   Development of staff
   Leadership and influence
   Instructional leadership

V. Personal
   Initiative/innovativeness

Stine, D. O. (1998) Executive Summary of 17 selected school districts in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties.

Exhibit I

Principal Evaluation

1. Establish objectives
2. Compliance with District policies and procedures
3. Use good judgement in the expenditure of District funds
4. Program evaluation/student achievement data
5. Evaluation of subordinates
6. Efficient and proper utilization of school facilities
7. Proper placement of students according to their educational needs
8. Staff morale
9. Control of student conduct on campus and the maintenance of an appropriate educational environment.
10. Community relations involvement.

Stine, D. O. (1998) Executive Summary of 17 selected school districts in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties.

CO

Exhibit J

Principal Evaluation
"Management Competencies"

1. Knowledge
2. Planning and organization
3. Thoroughness
4. Flexibility
5. Problem solving
6. Commitment
7. Judgement
8. Creativeness
9. Communication
10. Attitude
11. Initiative
12. Perseverance
13. Staff relations
14. Community/client relations
15. Responsibility
16. Staff development
17. Leadership
18. Cost Effectiveness

Note: Evaluatee does a self-evaluation which is followed by the Evaluator's evaluation

Stine, D. O. (1998) Executive Summary of 17 selected school districts in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties

District Code – HS

Exhibit K

Principal Evaluation

"Management Evaluation Report"

Noted Strengths

Noted Needs

Other Comments

_____

Signature of Supervising Administrator

Employee Comments:

_____

Signature of Employee

Stine, D. O. (1998) Executive Summary of 17 selected school districts in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties.

Exhibit L

Criteria for Evaluating Principals

Organizes School to achieve instructional goals.

Provides instructional direction and leadership.

Develops long-range and short-range plans.

Selects and assigns staff members.

Maintains staff motivation and morale.

Manages conflict.

Represents school in outside contacts.

Seyfarth, J. T., (1991). Personnel Management for Effective Schools. Allyn and Bacon.

Exhibit M

Principal Evaluation

Subjective Criteria

Adaptability

Ambition

Attitude

Character

Commitment

Cooperativeness

Decisiveness

Dependability

Flexibility

Initiative

Judgement

Loyalty

Perseverance

Personality

Responsibility

Thoroughness

Versatility

Stine, D. O. (1998) Executive Summary of 17 selected school districts in Los Angeles, Riverside, and San Bernardino counties.

Principal Evaluation

Selected Evaluation Examples

Below are the coding symbols for the examples of evaluations included in this paper.

Coding

*First Notation

E Elementary

U Unified

H High School

Co County

**Second Notation

U Urban

S Suburban

R Rural

Exhibit O

Transformational Leadership Appraisal

Initiate and coordinate partnerships.

Value and promote lifelong learning.

Be committed to mentoring colleagues.

Establish networks for mutual support.

Be architects of change.

Orchestrate collaborative group processes.

Be visionary.

Stay focused on success for all students.

Implement continuous improvement strategies.

Understand and enhance positive organizational culture and climate

Be politically aware and sensitive in working with multiple constituents.

Promote innovation and risk taking.

Communicate passion and optimism for the profession.

Be values and ethics driven.

Stine, D. et al (1994) Fueling the Flame: Educational Renewal Through Transformational Leadership. ACSA. Sacramento, CA

Exhibit P

EVALUATING CORE VALUES

Empowerment

Decision Making

Belonging

Trust & Confidence

Diversity

Integrity

Student Success

Patterson, J. (1994). Leadership for Tomorrow's Schools, ASCD

Principal Evaluation: A Process for School Improvement and Accountability

Summary

Setting District Priorities

- Board Superintendent Plan
- Community/Staff Involvement
- Vision, Mission, Goal Setting

Determining the School Agenda/Principal's Role

- Leadership Team Planning
- Principal/Site Goal Setting
- Program Outcome Determination
- Expectations of Principal

  (personal, professional, administratively, job description)

The Evaluation Process

- Evaluation formats, timelines
- Superintendent/Principal Collaboration

  (District's Priorities, Program Focus, Principal's Goals)
- Calendar of Review of Key Indicators

  (Monitor and Reporting System)
- Communications – Conferencing, guiding, directing
- Principal Reflection

  (Data gathering, Self-reflection)
- Notice/Due Process

  (Adequate time for remediation if needed)
- Planning and Bridging to next year

Process Chart
Principal's Evaluation: Performance/Accountability

Month	Participants	Tasks	Comments
July	Board/Superintendent	*District VISION Revisited *Annual Goals set	Could include Community Goal setting and members of the superintendents cabinet
August	Superintendent / Principal	*School Goals *Expectations for Principal *Areas of Focus Identified	Should be a collaborative effort toward personal and professional improvements
September	Principal / Faculty Site Council	School goals and areas of focus refined	This is the site plan
December	Principal / Site Council	*Special Initiatives Determined *Mid-term Progress Report	
January	Superintendent / Principal	*Mid-term Monitoring *Principal Pre-Evaluation *Opportunities to Re-focus	Opportunity for formal feedback and adjustment
April/May	District/State Testing	*Academic Assessment *Achievement Analyzed	Data scrutinized to determine achievement strengths & weaknesses
June	Principal/Site Council	*Annual Report *Assessment Analysis	Summary data on all aspects of school Student Performance
June	Principal / superintendent	*School Wide Evaluation *Principal Evaluation	Macro View Personal / Professional

Notes: 1. Key Participants: Board, Superintendent, Principal, Faculty, Site Council
2. Key Process: Local Setting, Focus Determination Collaboration, Monitoring, Assessment Evaluation, Communications
3. Key Ingredients: Time Line, Specific goals, Agreed-upon process & format for reporting and Evaluation.

References

Association of California School Administrators, (1998). "Bill of Rights". Leadership, Directory and Guide to members benefits. ACSA, Sacramento, CA.

Jones, J. J. and Walters, D. L. (1994). Human resource management in education. TECHNOMICS, Lancaster, PA.

Lindahl, R.A. (1986) Implementing a new evaluation system for principal: An experience in planned change. Planning & Changing 17, 4. P224-32.

McCurdy, J (1983) The role of the principal in effective schools: Problems & solutions. AASA Critical Issues Report. Arlington, VA.

Murphy, R. (1996)Performance evaluation & discipline in the 90's for certificated and classified employees. An unpublished paper presented at ACSA Principals' Academy, San Bernardino, CA.

Patteron, D. (1991) Evaluating principals. ERIC Digest, NASSP. Reston, VA. #30

Rebore, R. (1998) Personnel administration in education a Management Approach. Allyn & Bacon, Needham Heights, MA.

Selins, H.C. (1994) The relationship between transformational and transaction leadership and school improvement outcomes. School Effectiveness and School Improvement 5 (3) 272-298.

Schmitt, A. & Cohen, S.A. (1990) Criterion related validity of the assessment center for selection of school administrators. Journal of Personnel Evaluation in Education. 4(2), 2003-212.

Seyforth, J. (1991). Personal management for effective schools. Allyn & Bacon.

Splitt, D. (1985). How to conduct the evaluation process. Tips for Principals, NASSP. Reston, VA

Stine, D.O. (1994). Principal Evaluation: A collaborative improvement process. Paper presented at the annual conference of the East Asia Regional Council of Overseas Schools, Bali, Indonesia.

Stine, D.O. (1994) Fueling the flame: Educational renewal through transformational leadership. ACSA, Sacramento, CA

Thomas, M. D. (1979) Performance evaluation of educational personnel. Phi Delta Kappa. Bloomington, IN.

Townley, A. & Schmieder, J., Wehymeyer, L. (1997) School personnel administration: a California perspective. Precision Writing, Riverside, CA.

Valentine, J. (1987). Performance/outcome based principal evaluation. ERIC Digest, NASSO, Reston, VA #60.

Webb, L & Green, J. Motello, P., Norton, M. (1987) Personnel administration in education. Merrill Publishing Co., Columbus, OH.

Weiss, Kathy (1989) Evaluation of elementary and secondary school principals. ERIC Digest, NASSP, Reston, VA. #60.